A peer-reviewed open-access journal
NeoBiota
Advancing research on alien species and biological invasions

NeoBiota 99: 265–283 (2025)
DOI: 10.3897/neobiota.99.154928

Research Article

Long delays in identification and publication of naturalized species: a case study of introduced grasses in Hawai‘i

Kevin Faccenda[1,2], Curtis C. Daehler[1]

1 School of Life Sciences, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, 3190 Maile Way, St. John 101, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, USA
2 Herbarium Pacificum, Bishop Museum, 1525 Bernice Street, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96817, USA
Corresponding author: Kevin Faccenda (faccenda@hawaii.edu)

Abstract

As introduced plants spread across the world, botanists documented their naturalizations—self-sustaining reproduction in new geographic areas—through herbarium specimens and published reports, the primary sources for the study and management of biological invasions. Invasion lag time, attracting much attention from both theoretical and applied perspectives, is typically defined as the time between introduction and when a species starts to spread rapidly, which can be minimally estimated as the time between introduction and the first reported naturalization. Delays in identifying herbarium specimens and publication delays may inflate reported lag times, but such delays have rarely been quantified. The Hawaiian naturalized grass flora serves as a case study to examine these human-caused delays among 269 species. From herbarium data, we found the collection date of the first naturalized specimen, when it was correctly identified, and compared these to the publication date of the first naturalization report. The average delay was 27 years (a median of 17 years) between the first naturalized herbarium specimen and its publication, although this delay has decreased over time. Included in this delay is the time needed for correct identification of specimens, which averaged 18 years, but had a median of 4 years, indicating that most grasses are quickly identified but some required decades. These delays, when not accounted for, obscure temporal trends in invasions. It is also important to understand and account for these delays to better characterize the phenomena that contribute to reported lag times for biological invasions. Minimizing identification and publication delays in the future will be important for successful management and control of new invasions. Expanded investment in and support of taxonomic experts at biodiversity institutions is needed to reduce reporting delays for new naturalizations.

Key words: Grass, hawaii, identification, invasive species, naturalization

OPEN ACCESS

Academic editor: Franz Essl
Received: 5 April 2025
Accepted: 7 June 2025
Published: 3 July 2025

Citation: Faccenda K, Daehler CC (2025) Long delays in identification and publication of naturalized species: a case study of introduced grasses in Hawai‘i. NeoBiota 99: 265–283. https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.99.154928

Copyright: © Kevin Faccenda & Curtis C. Daehler. This is an open access article distributed under terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (Attribution 4.0 International – CC BY 4.0).

Introduction

The study and management of naturalized plants (plants that are introduced to a new area and reproduce without direct human assistance; Richardson et al. 2000) and associated invasions that occur as naturalized plants spread, rely on accurate knowledge of species distributions in space and time. For plants, many researchers depend on naturalization information published in journals or botanical checklists (e.g. Seebens et al. 2017, van Kleunen et al. 2019; Seebens et al. 2021; Chen et al. 2022; Egawa and Koyama 2023; Holmes et al. 2023) to identify invaders and potential invaders, as well as to understand patterns in success of non-native plants

and their impacts. However, these are secondary sources, as in most cases, preserved specimens in herbaria are the primary sources documenting naturalizations. Because of this, there can be a delay period between when species are first collected and/or documented as naturalized in a herbarium, and when that naturalization becomes recognized to most researchers and policy makers through a publication.

These delays have important repercussions, as they may give false impressions of patterns of naturalization and invasion over time. Publication delays may also contribute to the enigmatic phenomenon of "lag times" (Kowarik 1995; Crooks 2005), where extended periods have been reported between the first record of introduction and the first report of naturalization or associated spread that results in invasion. Furthermore, reporting delays hinder on-the-ground eradication activities, which are most effective when populations are small (Reaser et al. 2020), as delays can allow populations to build up to unmanageable levels before the relevant information is available to decision makers. Prior work by Brock (2021) used simulations to examine the effect of delays between collection of naturalized specimens and their publication on perceived patterns of naturalization over time. These simulations showed that these reporting delays can lead to a perceived decreasing number of naturalizations when the number of new naturalizations is constant or even rising (Brock 2021). As such, these delays have the potential to affect our understanding of invasion patterns and processes and our successful management of invasions. Yet, the duration of these delay periods has rarely been quantified.

The time between a species' first naturalization and its publication as a new naturalization can be broken down into several steps leading up to the published report (Fig. 1). The first delay is the time between the naturalization or successful spread of a species and the detection or observation of the naturalized or successfully spreading population. This is necessarily unknown (Crooks et al. 1999) and depends on many factors such as search frequency and intensity, conspicuousness of the species, etc. Our study focuses on knowable delays highlighted in green on Fig. 1. Although we focus here on delays in reporting of first records of naturalization, in many cases these first records of naturalization also represent the starting points of invasions; therefore, these delays can be conceptualized as components of invasion lag times, which prior researchers have typically attributed to biotic and abiotic factors in the environment (Kowarik 1995; Crooks 2005).

To illustrate these potential delays in reporting of naturalizations (Fig. 1), we will use a case study of the naturalization of *Eragrostis superba* Peyr. (Poaceae) in Hawai'i. When a new naturalization is recognized in the field, typically a specimen is deposited in a herbarium, but this may not be immediate (Marsico et al. 2010), and the species might not be correctly identified. *Eragrostis superba* was first collected as a naturalized specimen in 1985 (E.J. Funk 252 BISH), but it was only identified as Poaceae at the time of collection. The first quantifiable delay, the identification delay, then starts as the specimen awaits correct identification. For *E. superba*, it was nine years before W.D. Clayton attached an annotation label to the specimen with the species identification. Once a specimen is correctly identified, there is then another delay before the species is published as naturalized. For *E. superba*, it was a four-year delay (Herbst and Clayton 1998). One could also consider a further possible delay between the primary publication date and the date when the species is incorporated into secondary sources, such as floras, checklists, or databases (Fig. 1). However, assessing that delay goes beyond the scope of this current work.



Figure 1. Conceptual diagram showing the lags and delays associated with naturalizations. Delays are associated with human processes, while naturalization lag is associated with biological processes. Components highlighted in green are quantified in this study.

The knowable delays discussed above in recognizing additions to a naturalized flora are caused by humans and are thus under the influence of many cultural and economic factors. This is in contrast to invasion or naturalization lags, typically envisioned as biological processes associated with naturalization and invasion, including the lag times from introduction to reproduction or dispersal and spread (Crooks 2005), although in practice such invasion lags will also include the human-caused delays unless they are explicitly factored out of invasion lags. Identification delays are likely to be longest for cryptic or non-charismatic taxa, a label many botanists would assign to grasses.

Introduced grasses (Poaceae) of Hawai'i, which are well-represented in herbaria with more than 16700 specimens, were chosen for this case study assessing delays between published records of introduction, collection of a naturalized specimen, identification of the specimen and publication of the naturalized record. The islands of Hawai'i, located in the tropical Pacific, contain a diverse range of habitats arising from interactions between elevation and the effects of trade winds include savannahs, dry forest, rainforests, cloud forests, and alpine shrublands. This environmental heterogeneity allows for a high diversity of both native and naturalized grasses in a relatively small area, including 280 species (Faccenda 2025). Grasses have been well studied in terms of their taxonomy and distribution in Hawai'i, with many floras documenting naturalized species over time (Hillebrand 1888; McClelland 1915; Hitchcock 1922; Whitney et al. 1939, O'Connor 1990; Clayton and Snow 2010; Faccenda 2022, 2023; Faccenda et al. 2024).

Between 1778, when Europeans first arrived to the Hawaiian archipelago, and 2023, approximately 557 grasses were imported to the islands (Faccenda 2025). The majority of these were deliberately imported by the Hawai'i Agricultural Experiment Station (HAES) for pasture use, as native grasses are not adapted to high intensity grazing (McClelland 1915). Numerous grasses also arrived accidentally through maritime routes (i.e. shipping), contaminated seed, and massive intentional importation of quantities of hay during the late 1800s and early 1900s (summarized in Faccenda 2025).

Using grasses in Hawai'i as a case study, the primary objective of this study was to quantify delays between documented naturalization and publication of naturalization, and to assess whether these delays have changed over time with increasing interests in naturalization and invasions and shifts in publishing culture. We hypothesized that the delay between the first record of a naturalized specimen and identification will be shorter for deliberately introduced species compared to accidentally introduced species, as deliberate introductions often have been assigned

presumed identities by the exporter or importer at their time of introduction. Quantification of these delays can provide new insights into naturalization patterns of invasive species and contribute to invasive species management in Hawai'i.

Methods

This study focuses on the first records of presence and naturalization of grass species across the main Hawaiian islands of Ni'ihau, Kaua'i, O'ahu, Moloka'i, Lāna'i, Maui, Kaho'olawe, and Hawai'i, excluding Papahānaumokuākea (northwestern islands) which are largely uninhabited atolls. We focus on the delay periods arising from the first report of a species on any of the islands (new state records), but see Brock and Daehler (2021) for an analysis on interisland spread. The checklist of naturalized grasses used for this work was recently assembled (Faccenda 2025) and includes all grasses recognized as naturalized through the end of 2023. This checklist also identifies each grass species as either deliberately or accidentally introduced. An accidental introduction is defined as the movement of a plant or its propagule to Hawai'i when its movement was not intended by the party that transported it. Non-persistent introductions (sometimes called casual or waif), those that occasionally appear from bird or crop seed but do not form persistent populations (Nesom 2000), were excluded from this analysis. This includes *Cenchrus americanus* (L.) Morrone, *Oryza sativa* L., *Panicum miliaceum* L., *Phalaris canariensis* L., *Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench subsp. *bicolor*, and *Triticum aestivum* L. Grasses hypothesized to be introduced by Polynesian voyagers are excluded from this study due to lack of dated records (Faccenda 2025).

The majority of first naturalization records come from herbaria. Herbarium data have been widely used to document the spread of naturalized plants (Marsico et al. 2010; Lavoie 2013; Osunkoya et al. 2021) and are considered the most comprehensive primary source for studying plant invasions (Brock 2021). Nevertheless, herbarium data are not perfect records of naturalization or invasion, as collecting is not uniform across space, time, or taxonomy (Daru et al. 2018). In addition, determining the naturalization status of old herbarium specimens is not always straightforward. Many specimens from Hawai'i collected before the 1930s have little information on their label, often only including a date and place name. Fortunately, labels of this era do frequently note cultivation status using terms such as "cult*", "garden", "planted", "trial", or "plot", and these specimens were not considered naturalized. There were also limited stations in Hawai'i where grass trials were cultivated, mainly Pensacola, Makawao, Poamoho, Koele. Specimens collected from these areas were also not considered naturalized unless the specimen label specifically noted that the collection was made outside of cultivation.

Naturalized species are defined as those which successfully reproduce in the wild (Category C2 or greater, Blackburn et al. 2011). As limited information on older labels made it impossible to apply this criterion precisely, any specimen for which there was no evidence of it being cultivated based on the herbarium label was assumed to be naturalized. This assumption may result in naturalization dates being earlier in time than reality if a herbarium specimen of a cultivated plant was not labeled as such or for casual naturalizations. The naturalization criteria (Category C2 or greater, Blackburn et al. 2011) could be much more confidently applied to more recent specimens, which tended to have labels specifically mentioning wild reproduction or population sizes. While it is possible that some of the specimens

that we consider the first naturalized records represent casual or non-persistent introductions, we believe that these are a small minority. Almost half of the naturalized species examined have an annual life-history (Faccenda 2025), strongly implying naturalization unless the collector happened to stumble upon the first colonist. Furthermore, many of the first naturalized specimens include notes on populations, making it clear they are naturalized.

Extensive collections of naturalized plants in Hawai'i were made by William Hillebrand when he lived in Hawai'i from 1851 to 1871, leading up to his Flora of the Hawaiian Islands (Hillebrand 1888). Unfortunately, the majority of these were destroyed in the bombing of the Berlin Herbarium in WWII (Hiepko 1987), and the surviving specimens in other herbaria are undated. All species cited by Hillebrand (1888) are therefore assumed to have been collected in 1871 (n = 10), which is the latest possible date for these collections. Similar reasoning was used to date specimens made by other early collectors who did not date their specimens; these were dated with the last year that the collector was known to make collections in Hawai'i (n = 10).

The identification delay is the time between the first naturalized collection of a species and the time at which the species was identified with the correct scientific name at the species level. This period ended when any specimen at any herbarium was correctly identified. To determine when each grass was first correctly identified, herbarium specimens of each species were examined, and the earliest label or annotation date with the correct identification was recorded. These specimens were principally examined in the Bishop Museum Herbarium (BISH) and photographed specimens from The Smithsonian Herbarium (US). Species that were identified with a name now recognized as a synonym were considered correctly identified. Synonymy information was obtained from Plants of The World Online (POWO 2024). Welch's T-test was used to test for differences in identification delays between intentionally and accidentally introduced species on log-transformed lags. Both mean and median delay times were reported due to the long-tailed distributions observed.

While modern herbarium convention involves attaching both the date and name of the identifier to an annotation label when identifying a specimen, this has not been consistent through time. Many specimens before the 1930s had identifications penciled in on the label without dates. When a specimen was identified correctly by the collector on a label with no specific identification date given, the identification date is taken to be the same as the collection date. As in most cases, the identification was made in the same handwriting as the rest of the label. This will bias the identification delay shorter as some identifications could have been made by a collector a year or more after collection. On the other hand, if species with undated identifications had instead been excluded from calculations involving identification delays, this would likely add a strong bias toward longer identification delays by excluding many specimens that were immediately identified by collectors while retaining old specimens first identified by modern botanists who consistently dated their identifications.

As grasses have been introduced to Hawai'i from across the world, their correct identification has proved challenging. Many species were misidentified and first published as naturalized under a misapplied name. An example is *Themeda villosa* (Poir.) A.Camus, which was first misidentified as *Themeda gigantea* Hack. In these cases, two publication dates were recorded, the date when a misapplied name was published, and the date when the misapplied name was corrected, allowing for the calculation of publication delays excluding or including misapplied names. The identification date was taken as the date when the misapplied name

was finally corrected. Several species now known to be introduced after European colonization were initially described as Hawaiian endemic species such as *Garnotia sandwichensis* Hillebr., *Agrostis kauaiensis* Hillebr., *Eragrostis hosakai* O.Deg., and *Syntherisma helleri* Nash. These are also considered misapplied identifications.

Publication delay is defined as the time between correct identification of a naturalized record and its publication in any publicly accessible written medium which describes the grass as naturalized. In the course of this research, naturalization records were found in various sources, including newspapers, agricultural literature, and more traditional botanical sources such as floras and checklists including Reichardt (1877), Hillebrand (1888), Heller (1897), McClelland (1915), Hitchcock (1922), St. John and Hosaka (1932), Ripperton et al. (1933), Whitney et al. (1939), Ripperton and Hosaka (1942), Degener and Degener (1946), Hosaka and Thistle (1954), Rotar (1968), St. John (1973), O'Connor (1990), Staples and Herbst (2005), and Clayton and Snow (2010). Searches were also made in the HathiTrust database (https://hathitrust.org) and Library of Congress's Chronicling America newspaper database (https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/) for the scientific and common names of each genus of grass known to be naturalized in Hawai'i, using filters to only include sources published in Hawai'i. The majority of modern naturalizations were published in the Bishop Museum Occasional Papers and were compiled by Imada (2019). Data are available in Suppl. material 1.

Results

A total of 269 naturalized grasses were included in this analysis; however, nine species were excluded from most delay analyses as they were apparently published as naturalized before a herbarium specimen was made. Eight of these are from the late 1890s and early 1900s, before Hawai'i had its own herbarium. The 9th is *Cenchrus ciliaris* L. which was published as naturalized by Ripperton and Hosaka (1942) before the first naturalized herbarium specimen was made in 1950.

A total of 103 grasses had specimens bearing correct identifications which were not clearly dated; when these were assumed to be immediately identified and assigned an identification delay of 0 years, the average identification delay across all grasses is 18 years (median 1 year), but this is an underestimation because some identifications must have been made more than a year after collection, as is known to be the case for more recent naturalized specimens (Table 1). After 1930, most herbarium labels have dated annotations, meaning that undated determinations were likely to have been made immediately by the author. After 1930, only 33 of 149 grasses were assumed to have a 0 year identification delay, with an average of 19 (median 4) years (Table 1). In many cases, identification delays were substantial, with 61 species taking over 30 years to be identified correctly (Fig. 2). A longer identification delay period was found for accidental introductions compared to deliberately introduced ($p = 0.02$; $t = 2.35$; $df = 255$).

Bothriochloa macra (Steud.) S.T.Blake had an unusual identification history as it was published in 1954 (Hosaka and Thistle 1954), yet no herbarium specimens bear this name as they were all misidentified as *Bothriochloa pertusa* (L.) A.Camus until 2022, when the species was independently identified by the author. Only after this 2022 identification was the 1954 original publication located. This was the only case where a publication was used to assign an identification date instead of a herbarium label annotation.

Table 1. Summary of delay periods. n = 260 species unless otherwise noted. Identification delays for grasses first collected after 1930 are separated as the annotation labels after 1930 are usually dated. *Assuming undated identifications were made the same year the specimen was collected.

	Median delay (years)	Mean delay (years)
Identification*	1	18
Identification, specimens after 1930* (n = 149)	4	19
Publication	6	14
Naturalization - publication of any name	17	27
Naturalization - publication of correct name	20	32



Figure 2. Histogram of various delay periods among Hawaiian naturalized grasses. A, time between collection of first naturalized specimen and its correct identification. B, time between the first correct identification of a specimen and when it was published. C, time between collection of first naturalized specimen and publication of its correct name (sum of A + B). D, time between collection of first naturalized specimen and the publication of any name, including names now recognized as misapplied.

The publication delay tended to be shorter with a mean of 14 (median 6) years, versus the mean identification delay of 18 years (median 1; Table 1). These combine to give a total delay of 32 years on average between the first naturalized specimen and its correct publication (Table 1).

The distributions of delays found by this analysis have long tails, with most species having relatively short delay periods, but others having substantially longer delay periods (Table 1, Fig. 2). The longest delay was 160 years between the first naturalized specimen and the correct publication of *Polypogon fugax* Nees ex Steud., a species whose identity was long confused and published under many misapplied names.

A total of 27 grasses were first published using misapplied names. It took an average of 53 (median 47) years before these misapplied names were corrected. The majority of these misapplied names were published before 1930, with only nine species first published using misapplied names after 1930. No naturalizations are known to be first published under misapplied names after 1998.

The number of naturalized, unpublished grasses present in Hawai'i has varied over time and peaked at 99 species in 1989 just before publication of the Manual of the Flowering Plants of Hawai'i (O'Connor 1990, Fig. 3C). Even after publication of this flora, 58 naturalized species remained unpublished (Fig. 3C).

The delay periods among identification and publication of grasses in Hawai'i have decreased over time (Fig. 4). The mean publication delay has been under 10 years since the 1970s, and the identification delay has been under 10 years since the 2000s. However, these delays must necessarily decrease towards the present, as the maximum delay for a grass found naturalized in, for example, 2020 would be 3 years, 23 years for 2000, etc. and it is possible that recent published naturalizations may include one or more misidentifications that will be corrected at a distant future date.

Discussion

Identification delays

A significantly longer identification delay period was found for accidental introductions compared to deliberately introduced species at 22 vs. 12 years respectively. This was expected, as plant collectors are often familiar with cultivated plants or with literature which describes cultivated species. In addition, well-identified cultivated herbarium material is typically available to herbarium workers to aid in identifications. In contrast, when a new accidental introduction appears, identified reference specimens are unlikely to exist locally, making identification more difficult.

It is notable how many grasses were first reported under misapplied names, totaling 27 species, or 10% of the grass flora. These misidentifications and long identification delays in general may be explained by the difficulty of grass identification. However, an argument could also be made that tropical plants have high rates of misidentification globally and the findings for grasses in Hawai'i are perhaps not unique (Goodwin et al. 2015). Grasses nevertheless comprise a large plant family, totaling about 11,000 species globally (Kellogg 2015) and considering that naturalized grasses in Hawai'i have arrived from across all biogeographic realms (Faccenda 2025), some misidentifications are to be expected. One must consult various resources and taxonomic keys from around the world in the hope of making an initial identification, and reference materials must be consulted (often from abroad) to confidently identify a new naturalized species.



Figure 3. Number of naturalized species over time as seen from different sources and number of herbarium specimens over time. **A.** Annual number of unique, naturalized grass herbarium specimens collected in Hawai'i with a 5 year rolling average; **B.** Number of naturalized species which would be obtained from various sources over time. The true number is based on the modern identifications of all herbarium specimens collected up to each year; **C.** Number of naturalized species omitted from published literature over time.

Identifications have also been confounded by a lack of accessible taxonomic literature at the time when naturalizations were first collected (Pyšek et al. 2013). This is exemplified in the case of *Cynodon aethiopicus* Clayton & J.R.Harlan and *Cynodon nlemfuensis* Vanderyst, species which were named only after they were introduced to Hawai'i. Grasses are also often considered a specialist group, and most collectors are not comfortable with their identification and submit herbarium specimens simply identified as "Poaceae" or at the genus level. Thus, specimens



Figure 4. Delay periods for grasses across decades. Species are placed in decades for their identification delay based on what decade they were collected. Similarly, species were placed in decades for their publication delay based on what decade they were identified. Only specimens first collected after 1930 shown as determination dates before then are less reliable.

often require either a taxonomic expert to visit Hawai'i or a duplicate specimen must be mailed to a grass expert outside of Hawai'i for identification. The difficulty in identifying grasses and other difficult taxonomic groups has certainly decreased in the internet age due to the sheer quantity of digitized taxonomic and herbarium material now available nearly instantaneously.

To decrease identification delays such that new unwanted naturalizations can be more effectively targeted for management action, investment must be made in training and retaining taxonomic experts at biodiversity institutions, especially herbaria (Pyšek et al. 2013; Goodwin et al. 2015). Forming partnerships between citizen scientists on platforms such as iNaturalist and taxonomic experts will also pay dividends as arrivals of new invasive species are frequently being discovered (though not always identified) by citizen scientists who share photos online (e.g Faccenda 2024). Machine learning and artificial intelligence (AI) tools for plant identification (Hart et al. 2023) may also help decrease identification delays. Investment in floristic inventories is also essential as field botanists and naturalists will have great difficulty recognizing new naturalizations in the field if there are no convenient resources that can be used to check the known naturalized species. This was the case in Hawai'i where the latest flora was published in 1990 (Wagner et al. 1990) and it is missing 121 grasses now known to be naturalized. Although one can now find additional resources (e.g. Faccenda 2023, www.mauu.net, www.plantsofhawaii.org) that supplement the naturalized species list found in the flora, these resources generally may not include identification keys. Unfortunately, investment in floras and taxonomy generally has been declining across the world (Kim and Byrne 2006; Drew 2011; Löbl et al. 2023), and is likely to further exacerbate identification delays.

Of the delays quantified here, the identification delay is the most likely to bias the data used for calculating presumed biological lags associated with invasion, as most workers now use herbarium data for calculating these lags rather than publication dates (e.g. Aikio et al. 2010; Larkin 2012; Osunkoya et al. 2021). Our study appears to be the first time that the identification delay has been quantified systematically for any taxonomic group, making it unclear how the delays among first reported naturalizations of Hawaiian grasses compare to other taxa in other regions.

Publication delays

Between the 1800s to 1990, the principal vehicles for publication of new plant naturalizations in Hawai'i were either floras (e.g. Hitchcock 1922, O'Connor 1990), or agricultural bulletins or extension reports (e.g. Ripperton et al. 1933; Whitney et al. 1939). There was evidently little interest in short notes documenting species spread and, as such, publication delays were longer in the past.

Now, a local journal (the Bishop Museum Occasional Papers) has emerged as the principal publication source for new occurrences of naturalized plants. This journal publishes the Hawai'i Biological Survey (HBS, Evenhuis and Miller 1995), initiated in 1992 by the Hawai'i state legislature and has made substantial contributions, reporting 398 naturalizations over its first 25 years (Evenhuis 2020). Only 4 of 121 grasses reported since 1992 were first reported in other journals. In the 32 years since establishment of the HBS, it has taken an average of 3 years between identification of a grass and its publication (Fig. 4). In contrast, in the 32 years preceding the HBS, this delay averaged 13 years. The HBS has likely decreased the publication delay across a diverse range of naturalized taxa. The HBS also likely helps explain the drop in the number of naturalized grass species which were identified yet unpublished ranging from a peak of nearly 60 in 1990 down to a range of 7–28 between 1992–2023, with the lowest number in 2023 (Fig. 3C). Other journals such as BioInvasions Records also specialize in publishing new naturalizations while many other journals also publish new naturalization reports without specifically specializing in them. Although there are now various options for publishing naturalization records, local journals can be especially effective for this purpose, especially if they are available online, as they allow researchers and managers to focus on one primary source for information on new naturalizations or emerging invaders.

The average publication delay found here, at 14 years, is much longer than typical publication delays for conservation science. An average delay of 3.2 years was found between data collection and publication among more than 7400 conservation and ecological studies across the full tree of life examined by Christie et al. (2021). The shorter delay found by Christie et al. (2021) might be due to the large number of ecology and conservation journals that are available specifically for publishing such work; whereas, limited outlets have been available for publication of naturalizations, and collectors may not always have had access to or awareness of publication outlets. At the same time, workers in conservation science may have greater incentive to publish research findings before another group "scoops" the research question, and because journal publications in conservation science are often important for career advancements (Berenbaum 2019). This delay is also shorter for conservation science due to survivorship bias, as it only includes published works, thus excluding the many studies which will never be published. This is unlike plant naturalizations, where a naturalization can always be published eventually, even if by a different researcher.

After a naturalization has been published, a further delay is associated with the synthesis of new naturalizations into secondary sources such as checklists and databases. While this was not quantified for the Hawaiian grass flora, Brock (2021) compared a database of first occurrences across all naturalized plants in Hawai'i based on herbarium data to the dataset of Seebens et al. (2017) which was based principally on secondary sources of first naturalizations. The bias due to this secondary source publication delay was substantial, resulting in misleading conclusions about naturalization patterns over time. Seebens et al. (2017) concluded from secondary source data that there was a plateau in plant naturalizations starting in 1980. Whereas the herbarium data showed no plateau in the number of naturalizations (Brock 2021) and revealed twice as many naturalizations after 1980 than were reported from secondary sources used by Seebens et al. (2017).

Naturalization to publication delays

No studies could be found that examine identification delays among naturalized species, and only a few studies could be located that report naturalization-publication delays. A median of 2 years' delay is reported among 145 invertebrate plant pests between 1970–2013 in Great Britain, where 97% of establishments were published within 13 years (Smith et al. 2018). Publication dates and first occurrence dates were compiled for 1056 naturalization events among introduced species in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean by Leihy et al. (2023). From these data we calculated an average delay of 7.2 years, median of 5 years, and maximum of 68 years.

Two studies have also examined delays among Mediterranean Sea organisms. An average naturalization to publication delay of 6 years was found among 776 species with the delay decreasing over time (Zenetos et al. 2019). However, Zenetos et al. (2019) exclude backdated naturalizations where a recent publication revealed that the naturalization date was earlier than the date mentioned in the initial publication, unlike this study which includes backdated reports. Delays between 0 to 38 years were reported among 83 Lessepsian fish species (those that migrated from the Red Sea into the Mediterranean via the Suez Canal). Although summary statistics are not reported, based on their fig. 6 it appears the median naturalization to publication delay was around 5 years (Azzurro et al. 2016).

Guedes et al. (2020) report a median of five years between the collection of the holotype specimen of a species, and the publication of a new species among 2661 reptile species described from 1992–2017. Similarly, Goodwin et al. (2020) found an average of 40 years between the collection of the first specimen, and the description of the species in the tropical genus *Aframomum* (Zingiberaceae).

The naturalization to publication delay reported here, averaging 32 years (Table 1) is much longer than those reported by other authors for other taxonomic groups. This may be partially due to inclusion of naturalized specimens in this analysis which are now available due to herbarium digitization and may not have been available to earlier authors. The Hawaiian grass flora was also neglected from 1950–1990, during which few new naturalizations were published, thus increasing delays.

Publication in online databases would be very efficient at reducing publication delays. However, this would not succeed at the ultimate premise of publishing — delivering information to those who seek it, as nobody would notice when a new entry quietly appears in a database. Traditional publication in a journal, newsletter, or extension publication with local readership would both alert its readership to

the naturalizations and also include important taxonomic, geographic, or ecological notes which are highly valuable to managers and field botanists. Ultimately, if the goal is to manage and eradicate invasive species, this information must be made available through a traditional publication even if it is technically published first in a database. Neither the Atlas of Living Australia (Belbin et al. 2021; ALA 2024) nor Euro+med (2006+) floristic databases directly publish new naturalizations, but rely on external publications or authorities as primary sources of naturalizations.

Synthesis

Despite delays in reporting naturalizations receiving little mention in the literature, these delays have important repercussions for both on the ground management of invasive species and our tracking of invasive and naturalized species. The Convention on Biological Diversity, an international treaty, calls for the reduction in spread of invasive species by 50% in 2030 (CBD 2022). To track our progress toward this goal, delay periods must be taken into account as analyses that ignore delay periods can indicate the number of new naturalizations is decreasing when it is, in fact, increasing (Brock 2021). These delays are expected to bias studies which examine accumulations of naturalizations in an area, but they will also bias studies reporting invasion lags presumed to have a biological basis, if the end points for lag times are determined by first publication date, or if herbaria house relevant unidentified or undatabased specimens due to limited taxonomic expertise or resources.

Furthermore, as McGeoch et al. (2023) note, examining the accumulation of naturalized species over time without also having data on collection effort will result in misleading conclusions and Fig. 3B demonstrates this well. Between about 2010 to 2020, the number of naturalized grasses plateaus (Fig. 3B); however, this is due to the number of specimens made per year, a proxy for survey effort, dropping to the lowest it has been since the early 1900s (Fig. 3A). Increased survey efforts beginning in 2020 led to the discovery of many naturalized species and a sharp rise in the number of naturalized species known from Hawai‘i (Faccenda 2022, 2023, 2024) and eliminating the apparent 2010–2020 plateau (Fig. 3B). The species accumulation curve now approximately mirrors that of the Hawaiian flora overall with an approximately linear trend between 1900 and the present day (Brock and Daehler 2021).

Due to publishing delays, data used for analyzing invasion trends should be obtained directly from herbaria and other biodiversity institutions, as that is only biased by the collection to identification delay (Brock 2021). Consulting herbaria may make analyses more complicated as further data cleaning steps may be needed to remove cultivated, non-established, or native specimens along with resolving synonyms which may not be necessary in the case of published data. However, mass herbarium digitization and software pipelines for processing herbarium data are making analyses such as this easier by the year (Chamberlain and Boettiger 2017; Chamberlain et al. 2020; Davis 2023). Furthermore, in regions where first naturalization dates have not been compiled into checklists or floras, gathering them from the herbarium record may take less time than a full literature review. At least in this analysis, gathering naturalization dates from herbaria took less time than finding these dates from the primary literature. This further calls for increased funding for herbaria such that these data curation steps can be done by herbarium staff, reducing the workload needed for researchers to use and interpret digitized herbarium data for invasive species management.

Hawai'i has been referred to as the "extinction capital of the world", in part due to the effects of invasive species (Asquith 1995; Wood et al. 2019; Rønsted et al. 2022) on its overwhelmingly endemic biota (Wagner et al. 1990; Roderick and Gillespie 1998). Newly arriving invasive species must be quickly eradicated to prevent further damage to the Hawaiian biota, but delays regarding the identification of these taxa confound management if species are not identified quickly. The ideal time for their identification and assessment is when populations are small because the likelihood of eradication drops exponentially as populations increase in size (Reaser et al. 2020).

Conclusion

There is a substantial delay period between the naturalization of grasses in Hawai'i and when they are published. Delays in reporting of naturalization must occur for similar reasons among many taxonomic groups around the world. Delays in identification and reporting of naturalizations hamper the study of the spread of invasions across the world and our ability to track our progress at controlling invasions to meet the agreements set in the Convention of Biological Diversity–a goal of reducing the new number of naturalizations by 50% in 2030. Delays also further hamper on-the-ground management of invasive species. To reduce these delays, investment in and increasing the number of taxonomists at biodiversity institutions must occur (Belbin et al. 2021). Furthermore, the creation of local journals that publish short form notes documenting the spread of invasive species are effective at reducing the time needed for publication of new naturalizations.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to the members of my graduate committee including Kasey Barton, Dave Beilman, Karolina Heyduk, and Cliff Morden, for encouraging this work and providing feedback on the manuscript. Mahalo to the staff at BISH especially Barb Kennedy & Tim Gallaher for much help in the herbarium.

Additional information

Conflict of interest

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Ethical statement

No ethical statement was reported.

Funding

No funding was reported.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: KF. Data curation: KF. Investigation: KF. Methodology: KF, CCD. Visualization: KF. Writing - original draft: KF. Writing - review and editing: KF, CCD.

Author ORCIDs

Kevin Faccenda https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3458-5671
Curtis C. Daehler https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1193-3634

Data availability

All of the data that support the findings of this study are available in the main text or Supplementary Information.

References

Aikio S, Duncan RP, Hulme PE (2010) Lag-phases in alien plant invasions: Separating the facts from the artefacts. Oikos 119(2): 370–378. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2009.17963.x

ALA Atlas of Living Australia (2024) Atlas of Living Australia. http://www.ala.org.au [Accessed 8 June 2022]

Asquith A (1995) Alien species and the extinction crisis of Hawai'i's invertebrates. Endangered Species Update 12(6): 6–11.

Azzurro E, Maynou F, Belmaker J, Golani D, Crooks JA (2016) Lag times in Lessepsian fish invasion. Biological Invasions 18: 2761–2772. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-016-1184-4

Belbin L, Wallis E, Hobern D, Zerger A (2021) The Atlas of Living Australia: History, current state and future directions. Biodiversity Data Journal 9: e65023. https://doi.org/10.3897/BDJ.9.e65023

Berenbaum MR (2019) Impact factor impacts on early-career scientist careers. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 116(34): 16659–16662. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1911911116

Blackburn TM, Pyšek P, Bacher S, Carlton JT, Duncan RP, Jarošík V, Wilson JR, Richardson DM (2011) A proposed unified framework for biological invasions. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 26(7): 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.03.023

Brock KA (2021) Biodiversity Informatics Approach to Preventing Invasions: Using a Whole Non-native Flora to Investigate Introduction Pathways and Methods for Invasion Tracking. Dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/81620

Brock KC, Daehler CC (2021) Plant naturalization trends reflect socioeconomic history and show a high likelihood of inter-island spread in Hawai'i. Invasive Plant Science and Management 14(3): 135–146. https://doi.org/10.1017/inp.2021.18

CBD (2022) Kunming-Montreal global biodiversity framework. UNEP—UN Environment Programme. http://www.unep.org/resources/kunming-montreal-global-biodiversityframework

Chamberlain SA, Boettiger C (2017) R Python, and Ruby clients for GBIF species occurrence data (No. e3304v1). PeerJ Preprints. https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.3304v1

Chamberlain S, Szoecs E, Foster Z, Arendsee Z, Boettiger C, Ram K, Bartomeus I, Baumgartner J, O'Donnell J, Oksanen J, Tzovaras BG, Marchand P, Tran V, Salmon M, Li G, Grenié M (2020) taxize: Taxonomic information from around the web. R package version 0.9.98. https://github.com/ropensci/taxize

Chen XL, Ning DD, Qian X, Jiang QY, Lu YY, Xu YJ (2022) Factors affecting the geographical distribution of invasive species in China. Journal of Integrative Agriculture 21(4): 1116–1125. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(20)63497-9

Christie AP, White TB, Martin PA, Petrovan SO, Bladon AJ, Bowkett AE, Littlewood NA, Mupepele AC, Rocha R, Sainsbury KA, Smith RK, Taylor NG, Sutherland WJ (2021) Reducing publication delay to improve the efficiency and impact of conservation science. PeerJ 9: e12245. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.12245

Clayton WD, Snow N (2010) A key to Pacific grasses. Kew Publishing, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.

Crooks JA (2005) Lag times and exotic species: The ecology and management of biological invasions in slow-motion. Ecoscience 12(3): 316–329. https://doi.org/10.2980/i1195-6860-12-3-316.1

Crooks JA, Soulé ME, Sandlund OT (1999) Lag times in population explosions of invasive species: causes and implications. In: Sandlund OT, Schei PJ, Viken A (Eds) Invasive species and

biodiversity management. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 103–125. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-4523-7_7

Daru BH, Park DS, Primack RB, Willis CG, Barrington DS, Whitfeld TJS, Seidler TG, Sweeney PW, Foster DR, Ellison AM, Davis CC (2018) Widespread sampling biases in herbaria revealed from large-scale digitization. The New Phytologist 217(2): 939–955. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14855

Davis CC (2023) The herbarium of the future. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 38(5): 412–423. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2022.11.015

Degener O, Degener I (1946) Gramineae. Flora Hawaiiensis, fam. 47. Published by the authors.

Drew LW (2011) Are We Losing the Science of Taxonomy? As need grows, numbers and training are failing to keep up. Bioscience 61(12): 942–946. https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2011.61.12.4

Egawa C, Koyama A (2023) Temporal trends in the accumulation of alien vascular plant species through intentional and unintentional introductions in Japan. NeoBiota 83: 179–196. https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.83.101416

Euro+Med (2006+) [continuously updated] Euro+Med PlantBase - the information resource for Euro-Mediterranean plant diversity. http://www.europlusmed.org [accessed 2024-10-07]

Evenhuis NL (2020) Twenty Five Years of the Records of the Hawai'i Biological Survey. Bishop Museum Occasional Papers 129: 1–2. http://hbs.bishopmuseum.org/publications/pdf/op129p1-2.pdf

Evenhuis NE, Miller SE (1995) Introduction. Bishop Museum Occasional Papers 41(80): 1–2. http://hbs.bishopmuseum.org/pubs-online/pdf/op41.pdf

Faccenda K (2022) Updates to the Hawaiian grass flora and selected keys to species: Part 1. Bishop Museum Occasional Papers 148: 41–98. http://hbs.bishopmuseum.org/pubs-online/pdf/op148p41-98.pdf

Faccenda K (2023) Updates to the Hawaiian grass flora and selected keys to species: Part 2. Bishop Museum Occasional Papers 155: 83–156. http://hbs.bishopmuseum.org/pubs-online/pdf/op155p83-156.pdf

Faccenda K (2024) Report of 24 new naturalized weeds across the islands of Hawai'i. Bishop Museum Occasional Papers 156: 71–110. http://hbs.bishopmuseum.org/pubs-online/pdf/op156p71-110.pdf

Faccenda K (2025) From the pasture to the present: The history of grass introductions in Hawai'i. Pacific Science 78(2): 165–200. https://doi.org/10.2984/78.2.4

Faccenda K, Yorkston M, Morden CW (2024) Updates to the Hawaiian grass flora and selected keys to species: Part 3. Bishop Museum Occasional Papers 156: 37–53. http://hbs.bishopmuseum.org/pubs-online/pdf/op156p37-53.pdf

Goodwin ZA, Harris DJ, Filer D, Wood JR, Scotland RW (2015) Widespread mistaken identity in tropical plant collections. Current Biology 25(22): R1066–R1067. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2015.10.002

Goodwin ZA, Muñoz-Rodríguez P, Harris DJ, Wells T, Wood JR, Filer D, Scotland RW (2020) How long does it take to discover a species? Systematics and Biodiversity 18(8): 784–793. https://doi.org/10.1080/14772000.2020.1751339

Guedes JJ, Feio RN, Meiri S, Moura MR (2020) Identifying factors that boost species discoveries of global reptiles. Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society 190(4): 1274–1284. https://doi.org/10.1093/zoolinnean/zlaa029

Hart AG, Bosley H, Hooper C, Perry J, Sellors-Moore J, Moore O, Goodenough AE (2023) Assessing the accuracy of free automated plant identification applications. People and Nature 5(3): 929–937. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10460

Heller AA (1897) Observations on the Ferns and Flowering Plants of the Hawaiian Islands. Minnesota Geological. and Natural History Survey Bulletin 9 (Minn. Botanical Studies Vol. 1): 760–922. https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/91281#page/326/mode/1up

Herbst DR, Clayton WD (1998) Notes on the grasses of Hawai'i: new records, corrections, and name changes. Bishop Museum Occasional Papers 55(1): 17–38. http://hbs.bishopmuseum.org/pubs-online/pdf/op55.pdf

Hiepko P (1987) The collections of the Botanical Museum Berlin-Dahlem (B) and their history. Englera 7: 219–252.

Hillebrand W (1888) Flora of the Hawaiian Islands: A description of their phanerogams and vascular cryptogams. Carl Winter, Heidelberg, Germany; Williams and Norgate, London; B. Westermann & Co., New York.

Hitchcock AS (1922) The grasses of Hawai'i. Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu. https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.15351

Holmes R, Pelser P, Barcelona J, Tjitrosoedirdjo SS, Wahyuni I, Van Kleunen M, Pyšek P, Essl F, Kreft H, Dawson W, Wijedasa L, Kortz A, Hejda M, Berrio JC, Siregar I, Williams M (2023) The naturalized vascular flora of Malesia. Biological Invasions 25(5): 1339–1357. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-022-02989-y

Hosaka EY, Thistle A (1954) Noxious plants in the Hawaiian ranges. Hawai'i Agricultural Experimental Station Bulletin 62. University of Hawai'i, Honolulu. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/13436

Imada CT (2019) Hawaiian naturalized vascular plant checklist (February 2019 update). Bishop Museum Technical Reports 69, 209 pp. http://hbs.bishopmuseum.org/publications/pdf/tr69.pdf

Kellogg EA (2015) Flowering plants, Monocots, Poaceae. In: Kubitski K ed. The families and genera of vascular plants. Cham: Springer International 13: 1–416. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15332-2

Kim KC, Byrne LB (2006) Biodiversity loss and the taxonomic bottleneck: emerging biodiversity science. Ecological Research 21: 794–810. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11284-006-0035-7

Kowarik I (1995) Time lags in biological invasions with regard to the success and failure of alien species. In: Pysek P, Prach K, Rejmanek M, Wade M (Eds) Plant Invasions: General Aspects and Special Problems. SPB Acad., Amsterdam, 15–38.

Larkin DJ (2012) Lengths and correlates of lag phases in upper-Midwest plant invasions. Biological Invasions 14: 827–838. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-011-0119-3

Lavoie C (2013) Biological collections in an ever changing world: Herbaria as tools for biogeographical and environmental studies. Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics 15(1): 68–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ppees.2012.10.002

Leihy RI, Peake L, Clarke DA, Chown SL, McGeoch MA (2023) Introduced and invasive alien species of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean Islands. Scientific Data 10(1): 200. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-023-02113-2

Löbl I, Klausnitzer B, Hartmann M, Krell FT (2023) The silent extinction of species and taxonomists—An appeal to science policymakers and legislators. Diversity 15(10): 1053. https://doi.org/10.3390/d15101053

Marsico TD, Burt JW, Espeland EK, Gilchrist GW, Jamieson MA, Lindström L, Roderick GK, Swope S, Szűcs M, Tsutsui ND (2010) PERSPECTIVE: Underutilized resources for studying the evolution of invasive species during their introduction, establishment, and lag phases. Evolutionary Applications 3(2): 203–219. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-4571.2009.00101.x

McClelland CK (1915) Grasses and forage plants of Hawai'i. Hawai'i Agriculture Experiment Station Bulletin 36, 52 pp. https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.87657

McGeoch MA, Buba Y, Arlé E, Belmaker J, Clarke DA, Jetz W, Li R, Seebens H, Essl F, Groom Q, García-Berthou E, Lenzner B, Meyer C, Vicente JR, Wilson JRU, Winter M (2023) Invasion trends: An interpretable measure of change is needed to support policy targets. Conservation Letters 16(6): e12981. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12981

Nesom GL (2000) Which non-native plants are included in floristic accounts? SIDA, Contributions to Botany 19(1): 189–193. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41967771

O'Connor PJ (1990) Poaceae. In: Wagner WL, Herbst DR, Sohmer SH (Eds) Manual of the flowering plant of Hawai'i Vol 2. University of Hawai'i Press and Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu, 1481–1604.

Osunkoya OO, Lock CB, Dhileepan K, Buru JC (2021) Lag times and invasion dynamics of established and emerging weeds: Insights from herbarium records of Queensland, Australia. Biological Invasions 23: 3383–3408. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-021-02581-w

POWO (2024) Plants of the World Online. Facilitated by the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. http://www.plantsoftheworldonline.org

Pyšek P, Hulme PE, Meyerson LA, Smith GF, Boatwright JS, Crouch NR, Figueiredo E, Foxcroft LC, Jarošík V, Richardson DM, Suda J, Wilson JRU (2013) Hitting the right target: Taxonomic challenges for, and of, plant invasions. AoB Plants 5: plt042. https://doi.org/10.1093/aobpla/plt042

Reaser JK, Burgiel SW, Kirkey J, Brantley KA, Veatch SD, Burgos-Rodríguez J (2020) The early detection of and rapid response (EDRR) to invasive species: A conceptual framework and federal capacities assessment. Biological Invasions 22: 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-019-02156-w

Reichardt HW (1877) Beitrag zur Phanerogamenflora der hawaiischen Inseln. Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Classe 76. https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/35385

Richardson DM, Pyšek P, Rejmanek M, Barbour MG, Panetta FD, West CJ (2000) Naturalization and invasion of alien plants: concepts and definitions. Diversity and distributions 6(2): 93–107. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1472-4642.2000.00083.x

Ripperton JC, Hosaka EY (1942) Vegetation zones of Hawaii. Honolulu (HI): Hawai'i Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 89, University of Hawaii, 60 pp.

Ripperton JC, Goff RA, Edwards DW, Davis WC (1933) Range grasses of Hawai'i. Bulletin of the Hawai'i Experiment Station 65, 60 pp. https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.87631

Roderick GK, Gillespie RG (1998) Speciation and phylogeography of Hawaiian terrestrial arthropods. Molecular Ecology 7(4): 519–531. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-294x.1998.00309.x

Rønsted N, Walsh SK, Clark M, Edmonds M, Flynn T, Heintzman S, Loomis A, Lorence D, Nagendra U, Nyberg B, Opgenorth M, Weisenberger L, Williams A, Wolkis D, Wood KR, Keir M (2022) Extinction risk of the endemic vascular flora of Kauai, Hawai'i, based on IUCN assessments. Conservation Biology 36(4): e13896. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13896

Rotar PP (1968) Grasses of Hawaii. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824885182

Seebens H, Blackburn TM, Dyer EE, Genovesi P, Hulme PE, Jeschke JM, Pagad S, Pyšek P, Winter M, Arianoutsou M, Bacher S, Blasius B, Brundu G, Capinha C, Celesti-Grapow L, Dawson W, Dullinger S, Fuentes N, Jäger H, Kartesz J, Kenis M, Kreft H, Kühn I, Lenzner B, Liebhold A, Mosena A, Moser D, Nishino M, Pearman D, Pergl J, Rabitsch W, Rojas-Sandoval J, Roques A, Rorke S, Rossinelli S, Roy HE, Scalera R, Schindler S, Štajerová K, Tokarska-Guzik B, van Kleunen M, Walker K, Weigelt P, Yamanaka T, Essl F (2017) No saturation in the accumulation of alien species worldwide. Nature Communications 8(1): 14435. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms14435

Seebens H, Bacher S, Blackburn TM, Capinha C, Dawson W, Dullinger S, Genovesi P, Hulme PE, van Kleunen M, Kühn I, Jeschke JM, Lenzner B, Liebhold AM, Pattison Z, Pergl J, Pyšek P, Winter M, Essl F (2021) Projecting the continental accumulation of alien species through to 2050. Global Change Biology 27(5): 970–982. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15333

Smith RM, Baker RHA, Collins DW, Korycinska A, Malumphy CP, Ostojá-Starzewski JC, Prior T, Pye D, Reid S (2018) Recent trends in non-native, invertebrate, plant pest establishments in Great Britain, accounting for time lags in reporting. Agricultural and Forest Entomology 20: 496–504. https://doi.org/10.1111/afe.12282

St. John H (1973) List and summary of the flowering plants in the Hawaiian Islands. Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden Memoirs 1, Lawai, Hawai'i.

St. John H, Hosaka EY (1932) Weeds of the pineapple fields of the Hawaiian Islands. University of Hawaii Honolulu. https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.b3893527

Staples GW, Herbst DR (2005) A tropical garden flora: plants cultivated in the Hawaiian Islands and other tropical places. Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu, 908 pp.

van Kleunen M, Pyšek P, Dawson W, Essl F, Kreft H, Pergl J, et al. (2019) The global naturalized alien Flora (Glo NAF) database. Ecology 100(1): e02542. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2542

Wagner WL, Herbst DR, Sohmer SH (1990) Manual of the flowering plants of Hawai'i. 2 vols. University of Hawai'i Press & Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu.

Whitney LD, Hosaka EY, Ripperton JC (1939) Grasses of the Hawaiian ranges. Bulletin of the Hawai'i Agricultural Experiment Station 82, 152 pp. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/13439

Wood KR, Oppenheimer H, Keir M (2019) A checklist of endemic Hawaiian vascular plant taxa that are considered possibly extinct in the wild. National Tropical Botanical Garden, Technical Report# 314, 16.

Zenetos A, Gratsia E, Cardoso AC, Tsiamis K (2019) Time lags in reporting of biological invasions: The case of Mediterranean Sea. Mediterranean Marine Science 20(2): 469–475. https://doi.org/10.12681/mms.20716

Supplementary material 1

Publication and identification dates for Hawaiian introduced grasses

Authors: Kevin Faccenda

Data type: csv

Explanation note: Dates of first collection, identification, and publication of every naturalized grass found in Hawai'i. Some citations may not be in the works cited, missing citations can be found in Faccenda 2025.

Copyright notice: This dataset is made available under the Open Database License (http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/odbl/1.0/). The Open Database License (ODbL) is a license agreement intended to allow users to freely share, modify, and use this Dataset while maintaining this same freedom for others, provided that the original source and author(s) are credited.

Link: https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.99.154928.suppl1